

or divergent races of *H. hirsutus*, since the morphological characters separating the three groups are so variable. One is often led to suspect that his final decision as to the identity of a specimen has been influenced overmuch by personal inclination or chance. One receives a similar impression with the specimens in the group *H. strumosus*, *H. formosus*, and *H. leoninus*.

DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY,
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

A FURTHER NOTE ON *SOLIDAGO RIGIDA* L.¹ The late K. K. Mackenzie and I had many arguments on points of nomenclature, particularly on methods of typifying old species. A few of them got published; more remain in the files of a correspondence probably as acrimonious as any which ever took place and still left the participants personally friendly. He and I were somewhat like the professional soldiers of the eighteenth century—hostile enough at the moment of battle, but afterward disposed to accept one another as brothers in our craft. On the rather rare occasions when I did something of which he could approve, he was generous in his commendation; and I am indebted to him for several notable kindnesses. It seems almost like taking a mean advantage to continue an argument now that he cannot reply; I shall rather miss the pungent rejoinder he would have been sure to make.

But the primary object of this note and of a few which may follow it is not to prove Mackenzie wrong, but to complete the record. Whether one takes his point of view or mine, it should be of advantage to have all the evidence at hand. And one part of it—the specimens which lie back of the Linnean citations—has not, in this instance, hitherto been investigated. Therefore, when a visit to Europe in 1935 gave me the opportunity, I attempted to find and examine such of them as are still in existence.

It will be recalled that Linnaeus based *Solidago rigida* wholly on two references, one to Hortus Cliffortianus and one to a plate in Hermann's Paradisus Batavus. The specimen in the Clifford herbarium and a duplicate in the herbarium of Linnaeus himself have long been known and are *S. rigida* in the traditional sense. The issues between Mr. Mackenzie and me were two: first, whether these speci-

¹ See RHODORA, xxviii. 29 and 138 (1926); xxix. 26 (1927).

mens or the plate of Hermann should be taken as typifying the species; second, if the latter, whether or not he was correct in interpreting it as *S. patula*. It was to settle the latter point that I endeavored to find specimens which should represent Hermann's conception.

No specimens illustrating the *Paradisus* exist at Leyden or are known to exist elsewhere. Probably the nearest approach to anything authentic is a specimen in the Sloane herbarium at the British Museum. This is in the Bonivart collection (vol. 84), said by Sloane to have come "most of the garden of Leyden from Dr. Hermann, etc." Its label bears a reference to the *Paradisus* and a phrase-name which seems to be made up of excerpts from the various citations given by Linnaeus in the *Hortus Cliffortianus*: "*Virga aurea Americana s. Noveboracensis Doria similis late rigidoque folio. Par. Bat. Pr.*" The specimen is *S. rigida* in the traditional sense. So are an old specimen from the Paris garden¹ and two from the Chelsea garden, all bearing Hermann's phrase-name. I could find no specimens of any other species with this name attached.

The evidence from specimens, then, is of a rather negative character. There is no actual assurance that the Bonivart plant came from Leyden, though, since most of his material did, there is a fairly strong probability; and no connection between the others and Hermann can be traced. One thing, however, seems clear. During the period between the publication of the *Paradisus* and the *Species Plantarum*, Hermann's phrase-name was widely, if not universally, applied in the botanic gardens of the time to the plant which has ever since passed as *Solidago rigida*; and there is no evidence that it was ever applied to anything else. Mr. Mackenzie's case rests wholly on his own (to me, dubious) interpretation of the Hermann plate. The interpretation of Hermann's contemporaries, as well as of unanimous usage since, is against him. And the acceptance of the Clifford specimen, which Linnaeus saw, as the type of the species, seems more reasonable than ever.—C. A. WEATHERBY, Gray Herbarium.

¹ Which might possibly represent the plant back of the passage from Tournefort cited in the *Hortus Cliffortianus*. For full quotation of these references see RHODORA, xxviii. 30-31.

Volume 38, no. 448, including pages 101-164 and plates 408-411, was issued 7 April, 1936.